DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 295 147 CS 211 226

AUTHOR Chan, Joseph Man; Lee, Chin-Chuan
TITLE Shifting Journalistic Paradigms: Editorial Stance and Political Transition in Hong Kong.
PUB DATE Jul 88
NOTE 41p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (71st, Portland, OR, July 2-5, 1988).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Colonialism; Content Analysis; Cultural Context; *Editorials; Foreign Countries; Freedom of Speech; Ideology; *Journalism; Media Research; Models; *Newspapers; *Political Attitudes; Political Divisions (Geographic); Political Influences; Political Power; *Power Structure; *Press Opinion
IDENTIFIERS China; Great Britain; *Hong Kong; Journalism Research; Press Role

ABSTRACT

This paper suggests that the upcoming transfer of Hong Kong from Great Britain to the People's Republic of China (PRC) in 1997, offers a unique opportunity to observe how changing configurations in the political environment influence mass media. The article investigates how the Hong Kong press, which spans the entire left-center-right ideological spectrum, has begun to adapt its "journalistic paradigms" because of the political transition. The paper also (1) develops the concept of "journalistic paradigm" (taken-for-granted and unspoken assumptions); (2) traces the emergence of a dualistic power structure (colonial and Xinhau [New China] News Agency) in Hong Kong; (3) examines political ideology and partisan affiliation of the press; and (4) compares the direction and magnitude of editorial paradigm shifts in relation to press ideology. A content analysis of several newspapers, reported in the paper, reveals that the shifts of the "journalistic paradigms" are contingent upon the press' political affiliations--the rightist press has gradually converged with the centrist press, shifting from an initial stance favoring continued British rule to accommodate the PRC's takeover of Hong Kong, and the leftist press has reduced its anti-colonial overtone. One table of data and 73 notes are included. (MS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED295147

SHIFTING JOURNALISTIC PARADIGMS:

EDITORIAL STANCE AND POLITICAL TRANSITION IN HONG KONG

Joseph Man Chan and Chin-Chuan Lee

Paper presented at the annual convention of Association for Education and Mass Communication, International Communication Division, Oregon, 1988. This paper is scheduled for publication in the forthcoming issue of China Quarterly.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Chin-Chuan Lee
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Joseph Man Chan is a lecturer of Journalism and Communication at the Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shatin, Hong Kong.
Chin-Chuan Lee is an Associate Professor of Journalism and Mass Communication at the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota, U.S.A. He has previously taught at the Chinese University of Hong Kong and was a visiting scholar at the Institute of Ethnology, Academia Sinica during the Academic year 1986-87 under the auspicies of the National Science Council.

CS211226

SHIFTING JOURNALISTIC PARADIGMS!
Editorial Stance and Political Transition in Hong Kong

(Synopsis)

Britain will return Hong Kong to the People's Republic of China (PRC) in 1997. Xinhua (New China) News Agency, acting as the PRC'a surrogate embassy in Hong Kong, has not only risen to form a dualistic power structure with the colonial regime of Hong Kong, but posed a challenge to British dominance. This study reveals that the press has adapted editorially to this political realignment. The shifts of the "journalistic paradigms" are contingent upon the press' political affiliations. The rightist press has gradually converged with the centrist press, shifting from an initial stance favoring continued British rule to accommodate the PRC's takeover of Hong Kong. An ultra-rightist paper has closed down while the other has slightly moderated its anti-communist rhetorics. The leftist press has reduced its anti-colonial overtone.

Since the signing of Sino-British Joint Declaration in September 1984, Hong Kong has entered a transitional phase, preparing for its ultimate return to China in 1997. This transition is characterized by a drastic redistribution of power and authority and realignment of social forces. Most significantly, a dualistic power structure has emerged, signifying a rapid decline of traditional British colonial dominance and a corresponding rise of the People's Republic of China (PRC) in Hong Kong.

This political transition has produced profound implications for politics, economics, culture and other social realms in the Colony. It is important to note that the press in some respects is more vulnerable to this pressure than most business enterprises. If there should be a worst scenario after 1997, business enterprises may have an easier time to move out of Hong Kong. The press, because of the cultural and linguistic barriers, has fewer choices. For another, Chinese political culture puts a premium on the power of words.[1] The PRC has expended a considerable amount of efforts and energies in fostering a favorable press image before and after the Sino-British negotiations. Xinhua (New China) News Agency, the main institution that Beijing has in Hong Kong to carry out its policies, have actively and successfully woven a cooptative web with the media and journalists. Given the sensitive position of the press, it is reasonable to argue that what happens to press freedom and media performance may epitomize what might hold for other spheres of life. In other words, the fate of the press is an acid test of the PRC's policy of "two systems within one country."

1

Hong Kong is thus a rare living laboratory for observing how changing configurations in the political environment influence mass media. As part of a larger and ongoing research program, this article provides a timely analysis of how the press, which spans the entire left-center-right spectrum of ideology, adapts its "journalistic paradigms" since, and because of, the political transition. This article only reports editorial shift; evidence in other domains (news content, organizational change of the press) is reserved for other writings.

This paper will (1) first develop the concept of "journalistic paradigm," (2) trace the emergence of a dualistic power structure in Hong Kong, (3) examine political ideology and partisan affiliation of the press, and (4) comapre the direction and magnitude of editorial paradigm shifts in relation to press ideology.

Journalistic Paradigms: Continuity and Change

We define a "journalistic paradigm" as a set of taken-for-granted and unspoken assumptions, or gestalt worldviews that inform the media as to what "social facts" to report (and what not to report) and how to interpret them.[2] From an organizational perspective, a journalistic paradigm is an imperative to the mapping of time and space and to the organizing of a glut of "occurrences" into "news events."[3] We found that the Hong Kong press, driven by different political commitments, constructed radically different realities about a social protest. The fact that this protest had a highly ambiguous cause served to reveal the underlying logic of the journalistic paradigms in a

sharper focus.[4] Paradigms acquire stability. Journalism has a strong tendency to "normalize" anomalies and assimilate them into their explanatory framework. Exceptions prove normality, rendering visible the implicit news values and the boundaries of newsmaking.[5]

Like a scientific paradigm, journalistic paradigm shift occurs rarely.[6] The shift is the last resort. When confronted with newly discovered phenomena, the media may endeavor to "repair" old paradigms rather than undergo a fundamental paradigm change. Historically or presently, journalistic paradigms were and are shaped by social formations, i.e., the interpenetration between the state and society in general as well as the coalitions of dominant groups in particular. Mass media not only reflect the perspectives of the powerful but also power relations in society.[7] Mass media are likely to continue to "mirror" the dominant perspective unless challenged by a new countervailing power base that arises. Within this framework, the media also actively construct realities which interact with, or intervene in, social formations.

A scientific revolution, in the Kuhnian sense, abandons an old paradigm and adopts the new one simultaneously. The new paradigm puts the old data in new light by changing some of the field's most elementary theorems. The shift of a journalistic paradigm may or may not be so abrupt. Unless there is a revolution that may radically transform the "journalistic paradigms," reality is usually redefined in a cumulative and incremental fashion.[8] If the paradigm shift is ahead of public readiness,

the media risk being perceived as "caving in to the pressure," thus deterimental to their credibility. Hong Kong's political transition is gradually phased-in, so there is an anticipated schedule for sociopolitical and journalistic transformations.

Formation of a Dualistic Power Structure

In the absence of party and electoral politics, the colonial administration has until recently enjoyed a virtual monopoly of political power. Hong Kong's political system approximates the ideal type of a bureaucratic polity, whose decision-making is relatively insulated from social and political forces outside the highest elite echelons of the bureaucracy.[9]

Although Britain was one of the first countries to officially recognise the PRC, Britain rejected Beijing's repeated requests to set up an official mission in Hong Kong for fear of a potential threat to its legitimacy. Thus, since 1949, the Hong Kong branch of Xinhua News Agency has acted as the PRC's de facto official representative in Hong Kong. To wit, Xinhua has had double roles to play, both as a news agency and a political agency. Out of its some 500 staff members, only 30 work in the news division, others are assigned to various political tasks. Xinhua coordinates and supervises the PRC's interlocking organizations (banks, trade companies, schools, motion picture and publication companies and labor unions) in Hong Kong and represents the PRC in dealing with the colonial regime.

In spite of this, Britain has treated Xinhua as a foreign agency. Xinhua, whose operation was a public mystery, had not

been able to countervail British dominance. All these began to change in 1982 when "Hong Kong's future" became an issue. Xinhua moved to the foreground and constituted a second power center both during the Sino-British negotiation period (1982-84) and its aftermath. In the post-accord period Xinhua has made its influence deeply felt in every realm of social life. Most significantly, Xinhua is the organizer, coordinator and supervisor of the Basic Law Drafting Committee and its Consultative Committee, both designed to formulate a framework for future Hong Kong.

Within the PRC's political structure, Xinhua assumes the equivalent of a provincial-level organization. After Xu Jiatun, a member of the CCP Central Committee, became its director in 1983, he reorganized Xinhua to comprise 10 departments mimicking the colonial government structure. He has also set up three district offices to extend Xinhua's influence and to "monitor public opinions" on a more local basis. Regarded as Hong Kong's "shadow government," Xinhua has actively recruited local talents to cope with the political transition and to fill the British vacuum in 1997.[10] Xinhua has woven a cooptative fabric which stretches from institutional absorption to friendship bond and which engulfs both media owners and young staffers. This is part of the PRC's "united front" strategy and it seems to have produced considerable implications.[11]

Partisan Newspapers in a Colonial Marketplace

This article attempts to relate journalistic paradigm change to the formation of the twin power centers--i.e., the colonial regime and Xinhua. It is important to note that Hong Kong has one of the most tolerant press systems in the entire Third World, with minimum government control. What Seymour-Ure observes as a close press-party "parallelism" prevalent in Europe and the Third World, applies to this colonial city-state.[12] The partisan press is linked to political party organizations, loyal to party goals, and caters to partisan audiences. However, Hong Kong has no local parties. Press partisanship is intertwined with, and sharply divided on the line of, the CCP-KMT (Kuomintang) conflict. The British, keeping the rules of the political game, have been tolerant of the CCP-KMT propaganda battles fought within the framework of social order and British rule.

The partisan press, however, coexists with the commercial press. Around 1970, responding to the rapidly expanding market economy, "centrist" newspapers began to emerge and prosper. They are loyal to Hong Kong and critical of both Beijing and Taipei. While devoting significant coverage to Chinese politics, these papers appear to focus more on local issues and the immediate concerns of Hong Kong citizens at large. It is not in their interest to identify too closely with either external party.

On the basis of (1) source of financial support and party linkage; (2) place of registration; (3) choice of national day and calendar; and (4) ways of addressing the Beijing regime and the Taipei regime, the nine papers for this study (chosen for their influence and representativeness of

ideological positions) can be arrayed as follows:[13]

(i) Ultra-leftist: As the CCP's propaganda mouthpieces supervised by Xinhua Hong Kong Branch, they include Ta Kung Pao and Wen Wei Pao. Registered in Hong Kong and mainland China, they celebrate national day on October 1, adopt the Western calendar, refer to Taiwan as "Taiwan " "the Taiwan authorities," or "the Chiang Clique," but call Beijing "our country," "our government," "the People's Republic of China," or "China."

(ii) Centrist: Market-oriented, advertising-supported, and not linked to any political party, they register only with the Hong Kong Government, adopt the Western calendar, do not observe either national day, call the Taipei regime "Taiwan," "the National Government" and the Beijing regime "Communist China," "Mainland China," or "China." The centrist papers we sampled include Ming Pao, Sing Pao and the Oriental Daily News.

(iii) Mainstream rightist: Most prominent are Sing Tao Jih Pao and Wah Kiu Yat Pao, founded in 1938 and 1925 respectively. They are responsive to the Hong Kong market, yet mildly tilting to Taiwan out of political ideology and historical ties with the KMT. They register both in Taiwan and Hong Kong, observing the KMT's national day on October 10, calling the Taiwan regime "the Republic of China" or "Nationalist China" and referring to the mainland regime as "Communist China," "the Mainland," instead of the "People's Republic of China." (Much has changed recently, as will be shown.)

(iv) Ultra-rightist: These include the Hong Kong Times and the Kung Sheung Daily. The Times was established by the KMT in

1949 as a propaganda outpost--at the threshold of the Chinese mainland--in the wake of its withdrawal to Taiwan. Kung Sheung has a strong historical presence and once ranked itself with Sing Tao and Wah Kiu as a mainstream paper. While loyal to the colonial regime, its anti-communist fervor bears a strong resemblence to the Times'. In an inaugural editorial (in 1925) Kung Sheung professed its aim to check the "communist tide" surging in China. The paper's ties with the KMT increased during the Anti-Japanese War and the subsequent civil war years.[14]

Hypotheses and Methodology

Viewing mass media as a social subsystem that is conditioned by the configuration of social forces, we investigate journalistic paradigm shifts as a response to a major structural redistribution of power in society. The latter sets the general direction of adaptation for media organizations and limits their strategic options. The new power center incorporates the media through cooptation or coercion or both. From the resource-dependence perspective, the media institutions depend on external resources and must respond to incorportion. Environmental pressure, however, is not uniformly absorbed and may result in differential media adaptation.

A general theoretical perspective that seeks to elucidate the structural relations between mass media and the power center in society has been developed in Lee and Chan.[15] Specifically, this article aims to analyze the direction and extent of journalistic paradigm shift towards the twin power centers (the colonial regime and Xinhua) both before and after the Sino-

British accord. We hypothesize that the magnitude of journalistic paradigm shift due to structural power transformation is inversely related to the ideological extremity of the press. It follows:

(1) The Mainstream newspapers (centrist and rightist), by virtue of their relative ideological and organizational flexibility, will show a more visible general shift in the journalistic paradigms to accommodate Xinhua as the new political power. They may remain loyal to the colonial regime at the same time.

(2) The ultra-rightist papers, because of their ideological extremity, have less latitude of movement and hence would display less accommodation towards Xinhua than do the mainstream papers.

(3) The ultra-leftist papers, for the sake of a smooth transition, might move away from their traditional anti-colonial stance to cultivate a cordial relationship with the Hong Kong government.

Methodologically this article is an effort of qualitative content analysis which "'tease(s) out' those determining but hidden assumptions which in their unique ordering remain opaque to quantitative content analysis".[16] Both qualitative and quantitative analyses, however, complement each other. The conclusions of this study, based qualitatively on the editorials, are corroborated by our related quantitative research on the paradigm shift in news reports during the same period.

We intensively interrogated 1,131 editorials carried by 9 papers between September 1982 and February 1986. Table 1 sums up the distribution of editorials analyzed. Our interrogation proceeded with hypotheses that emerged from our previous work and

from "soaking" in the press materials. Since day-to-day newspaper editorials tend to be repetitive in a given time, we identify the text and quotes in accordance with the criteria of (1) political significance; (2) ability to represent the mode of the recurring themes; and (3) ability to preserve the subtlety of the latent and contextual meaning structure that signifies the change of themes, tones, and phrases over time.

Table 1: Distribution of editorials analysed

Ultra rightist	Hong Kong Times	96
	Kung Sheung	229
Rightist	Sing Tao	114
	Wah Kiu	62
Centrist	Ming Pao	310
	Sing Pao	60
	Oriental Daily News	121
Ultra-leftist	Wen Wei	85
	Ta Kung	55

N = 1132

A number of comparative check points have been made to guard against the likely though unwitting tendency to disregard unsupportive evidence First, using the date of the signing of the Sino-British Joint Declaration (September 1984) as a watershed point, we scrutinized the editorial paradigms before and after this monumental event. Second, we cross-compared the shift of editorial paradigms by 9 papers organized into four ideological strata. To enrich analytical depth and to maintain a critical eye on the materials, we examined the differences that existed both between and within the strata. Finally, this incisive editorial reading is coupled with interviews with journalists, government officials and Xinhua cadres; published doucuments;

journalist's memoirs; and magazine analysis.

Journalistic Paradigms in Flux

The "Hong Kong issue" has dominated the news since 1982. The nature of the issue has taken on many zig-zags. Journalistic paradigm shifts, depending on the political/ideological commitment of individual papers, closely followed the life cycle of the issue in stages. When the PRC revealed in 1982-83, via informal channels, its intention of regaining Hong Kong, all but the Communist press greeted it with utter distrust--on the grounds that Hong Kong's prosperity would be untenable under Chinese rule. Most editorials firmly supported British effort to gain the PRC's concession for a continued British presence beyond 1997. This editorial chain of considerable unanimity began to break when Hu Yaobang, then director-general of the CCP, confirmed the long-circulated rumor of China's intention to retake Hong Kong. Shifts in centrist and rightist journalistic paradigms became particularly discernable and were further precipitated in 1984 by the British decision to forfeit Hong Kong and by the Sino-British Joint Declaration. As expected, some papers shifted their stance more drastically, others more reservedly. In what follows, we shall show that the nature and extent of change is principally contingent on where each paper stands in the political/ideological spectrum.

Rightist Journalistic Paradigm

Sing Tao: Sing Tao supported a continued British rule with greater persistence than Wah Kiu. When the sovereignity issue first came into being, a typical editorial read. "There is no place for the British (to play) in Communist China's blueprint

on Hong Kong. Under this circumstance, will the British remain to take up some administrative responsibilities? Definitely not. But whether the British have the full administrative power or not is the deciding factor of confidence and capital movement. Beijing leaders have missed this point."[17] Like many non-leftist newspapers, Sing Tao was confident that the British commitment could fend off the PRC's pressure. In 1982, for example, right after Britain agreed to enter into negotiation, Sing Tao editorialized: "Mrs. Thatcher, in the first hours of her first day in Hong Kong, has twice pledged that Britain would be responsible to the Hong Kong people and would express their interests during the negotiations with mainland China.....Because she has correctly grasped the 'reality' of the Hong Kong people and their desire to maintain the status quo, she is uniquely qualified to perform the promised responsibility and to express Hong Kong people's interests."[18] Sing Tao's support remained unfailing throughout the entire negotiation.[19]

Again, like many others, Sing Tao had faith in Britain's commitment to the status quo. It also overestimated the role of China's economic dependence on Hong Kong while underestimating the PRC's political aim to use Hong Kong as a showcase for the sake of unifying with Taiwan. Thus, Sing Tao, concluded that there were "absolute reasons" to believe that Hong Kong would have a "bright future" (i.e. maintaining the status quo).[20]

As soon as the Sino-British Joint Declaration was initialed, Sing Tao showed signs of acquiescing to the newly defined political "reality." For example, it argued, "The five

million people of Hong Kong have no choice but to have confidence in the `Sino-British Agreement' which determines Hong Kong's future. It is superfluous to doubt whether the Hong Kong people have confidence or not. Moreover, there is no reason why the Chinese majority of the local population who have created prosperity during British rule cannot maintain Hong Kong's prosperity when it is returned to China. It is clear that the rise and fall of Hong Kong, from now on, depends not only on the Hong Kong people but primarily on Beijing. If Beijing has confidence in implementing the `Sino-British Agreement' and the scheme of `one country, two systems,' Hong Kong's future prosperity will certainly be greater than it is now."[21]

Since late 1984, Sing Tao seemed to have had a change of tone, consistently supporting the Sino-British accord. Past worries seemed to have been replaced by a growing confidence. In late 1984, for example, it noted: "Businessmen and government economic agencies from all the world have revived their confidence in investing in Hong Kong in the past ten months. The speed and magnitude of investment growth is unparalleled. This is very important for it at least erases people's worries about Hong Kong's future and the gloomy atmosphere, encouraging Hong Kong citizens to strive on for further economic prosperity and social stability." The very first condition for the growth of confidence in Hong Kong, according to the same editorial, is to implement the `Sino-British Agreement.'[22]

In an annual review editorial, Sing Tao even appealed to national pride: "The dust aroused by the two-year-long negotia-

tion over Hong Kong's future is now settled by the formal signing of the Sino-British Agreement. The wounds and tears caused by the Opium War on the sons and daughters of China will soon fade into history. The life style valued by the Hong Kong people is guaranteed for fifty years in black and white terms. At the same time, both mainland China and Taiwan have scored notable achievements in developing their economies and living standards. They, together with the steadily progressing Hong Kong, each with their own merits, form a tripartite system which constitutes an economic force able to compete with Japan."[23] Such an optimistic vision was unthinkable just one year ago. One of its more recent editorials concluded: "First, we must have confidence in mainland China in implementing the `Sino-British Joint Declaration' (which the paper formerly called the `Sino-British Agreement' after the British fashion). Second, we should consciously and voluntarily work for a stable transition. Lastly, we should be proud to be Chinese and to return a perfect Hong Kong to China (which the paper formerly referred to as `Communist China' or `mainland China'). Every citizen should work for this from now on."[24]

Wah Kiu: Sharing two propositions with Sing Tao, Wah Kiu initially argued: (1) that mainland China was unlikely to retake Hong Kong for economic and strategic reasons;[25] (2) that British Prime Minister and other British officials were trustworthy negotiators on behalf of the Hong Kong people.[26]

Wah Kiu nonetheless differed from Sing Tao in some key respects. First, Wah Kiu quoted some social leaders to discredit such policies as "letting Hong Kong people administer Hong

Kong," while Sing Tao did not.[27] Second, it explicitly argued against the urge by Sing Tao and ultra-rightist papers to internationalize the Hong Kong issue.[28] Third, Wah Kiu's acquiescence was in greater haste than Sing Tao. Wah Kiu had quoted Chinese officials more often and at greater length even before Britain made public its intention to withdraw from Hong Kong. In the heat of negotiations in 1983, for example, Wah Kiu quoted Hu Yaobang lengthily to say: "Now Hu Yaobang has once and for all stated the (takeover) date, we no longer need to guess and speculate. Given a definite period, we had better prepare in our own social positions for the new reality that is emerging."[29] Typifying its sharpened journalistic paradigm shift, the paper proclaimed in January 1984: "For China (formerly referred to as `Communist China' or `mainland China') to retake Hong Kong's sovereignty as well as jurisdictive power is absolutely righteous because Hong Kong is part of Chinese territories and its inhabitants are Chinese. If China, which owns the land and the people, is not entitled to Hong Kong's sovereignty, and what kind of ridiculous world would it be?"[30] Shortly before the Joint Declaration was initialized, Wah Kiu asserted that Hong Kong people "had no reasons to feel uneasy or lack of confidence in the future of Hong Kong."[31]

Centrist Journalistic Paradigm

Oriental Daily News: Deliberately "apolitical" and non-controversial, its short daily editorial does not touch on Hong Kong's future except on a few very important occasions (e.g., the signing of the Sino-British accord). Instead, the politically

sharp Miu Yiu Column, signed and written by a deputy editor, is generally regarded as the paper's "surrogate editorial."

At the outset, in 1982, Miu Yu deemed nationalism as an "abstract" principle which must not be used to dictate the return of Hong Kong to China. He said: "From hundreds of readers' letters sent to me, not a single one agrees to an immediate retake of Hong Kong. Does this indicate that the Daily's readers do not care about the righteousness of nationalism? When righteousness contradicts interests, we need to keep cool in the analysis of costs and benefits. This is not to say that the righteousness of nationalism can be done away with. But in the last analysis, nationalism is mental, conceptual, theoretical and abstract in nature while interests are concrete and personal. At this juncture labelling other people as 'traitors to Chinese nationalism' is no proof of the labellers' righteousness of the labellers but of their craziness."[32] He often reiterated the concern for China's "inevitable" interference should Hong Kong become China's special administrative region. He commented for example, "Although the Chinese constitution may be drawn upon to protect `one country, two systems' or `one country, two sets of law' .....it is inevitable that the lawmakers will include some mainland Chinese other than British and Hong Kong citizens and that the present Supreme Court of Appeal in London will be relocated in Beijing --by then the spirit of the rule of law in the British tradition will be all scraped."[33] In short, in Miu Yiu's estimation, "one country, two systems" was an an infeasible idea.

Signs of a journalistic paradigm shift were visible as early as December 8, 1983. Miu Yiu concluded in one of his columns, as follows: "Beijing has sufficiently understood the importance of Hong Kong's prosperity. What the Hong Kong people fear is that Communist China may fail to recognise this and may 'irrationally' act it out in Hong Kong. But all indicators seem to point out that this fear is unnecessary."[34] Miu Yiu increased his favorable portrayal of Xinhua, saying, "It (i.e., the New Year speech) is the first speech ever made by the head of Xinhua's Hong Kong Branch. In the past, no media organizations had invited the highest Chinese representative in Hong Kong to make such kind of speeches. This event indicates that Xinhua's increasingly significant role in Hong Kong's affairs begins to command greater attention from the mass media. ..... Director Xu Jiatun's acceptance to make the speech is not a `super-governor''s act to overwhelm Hong Kong. On the contrary, only a rejection (of invitation to speak) will pose himself as a `super-governor'."[35]

In marked contrast to his repeated assertions of the past regarding the CCP's untrustworthiness on account of historical record, Miu Yiu seemed to have developed a very different perspective by April 1984. He said: "The present leaders of the CCP have repeatedly self-criticized (their past radical lines) in their public speeches. In light of their ideals and interests, the sincerity of their self-criticism is not to be doubted. This new consciousness has induced the birth of the concept of `one country, two systems' which is different in nature from the CCP's deceptive policies on nationalist bour-

geoise in the fifties.[36]" He continued, "If we analyse Communist China's policies in Hong Kong merely in light of its past record and neglect all its present changes, we may be far from truth."[37]

Furthmore, Miu Yiu began to exemplify "one country, two systems" as a solution for international conflicts. He said: "In fact, the `one country, two systems'concept innovated by China is receiving increasing international attention and is generally evaluated to be a very honest and solid formulation that may be applicable in numerous international conflicts such as those between the Germanies and the Koreas."[38] From then on, Miu Yiu continued to expound China's Hong Kong policies,[39] quoting economic figures to support his optimistic evaluation of the future, and sometimes to explain away what he saw as a misunderstanding between Chinese leaders and the local press.[40]

Sing Pao: Taking a position that was generally mild and somewhat obscure during the early stage of the negotiation, this paper did not carry editorials until mid-1983. Quite revealing was its editorial September 23, 1983: "China always says that it will reclaim Hong Kong when the time is right. Is the expiration of the lease of the New Territories the right moment? Following the major goal set by China, let us use modernization as the criterion of judgment: leaving Hong Kong as it is would facilitate China's modernization. Taking modernization as the criterion is a flexible way of doing things while over-emphasizing the lease expiration is an indication of rigidity. Not only rigidity, it also damages a friendship

(between Hong Kong and the PRC) that has lasted for more than 30 years."[41]

Sing Pao's support of the status quo was precipitated by the relocation of Jardine Company, a leading British corporation historically tied to Hong Kong, at Bermuda. With a sense of urgency, it declared: "Communist China should renew its understanding of Hong Kong, do away with the 'emotional part' and revise the plans concerning Hong Kong's future. Within the principle of retaking Hong Kong's sovereignty, (China should) formulate policies on the basis of the concrete situation in order to preserve Hong Kong's stability and prosperity and to facilitate the modernization of our mother country (i.e., China) and its whole unification. .....In fact, the assumption of sovereignty itself is sufficient (to fulfil nationalism) -- after that, Hong Kong should be left alone to become a sufficiently atuonomous, free, democratic, prosperous and stable international city."[42]

Sing Pao however became quite favorably disposed to the final outcome of the negotiation. When the date of initializing the Joint Declaration was drawing near, Sing Pao began to emphasize the legal binding power of the Declaration and to portray it as "the brainchild of 'far-sighted politicians."[43] Sing Pao wrote a series of editorials praising the scheme of "one nation, two systems" after the initialization, one of which said: "The general reaction to the Joint Declaration just released is good because it is unexpectedly detailed and specific. It is better than expected. Overall, the majority of the Hong Kong people have accepted it; what differs is the extent of acceptance."[44]

In another, it argued, "We thought the most significant thing implied by the initialization of the Joint Declaration is that Hong Kong people will gradually be the master of Hong Kong, holding their fate and future in their own hands."[45] Sing Pao's positive assessement of China's policies in Hong Kong seems to increase with time. On January 7, 1986, for example, it said: "In 1985 which just ended, the greatest achievement of Hong Kong is its enhanced political stability. One year after the signing of the Sino-British Joint Declaration, the feasibility of 'one country, two systems' has beocme more and more deeply rooted in people's hearts."[46]

To sum up, Sing Pao provides a clear demonstration of an editorial shift that follows the larger power structural change in the system. From a status quo mindset, it became one of the first supporters of Chinese policies on Hong Kong. This is a paper heavily identified with the existing power rather than with consistent ideology.

Ming Pao: Positioning itself as a leading "intellectual paper," Ming Pao has made various proposals to mediate the positions of the PRC, Britain and the "Hong Kong people." The process of its editorial paradigm shift was at first subtle, gradual and smooth, but the pace was quickened once Britain announced that it would give up Hong Kong's sovereignty.

Based on the economic logic, Ming Pao was confident that China would not claim Hong Kong in 1997. It observed in 1981: "Thorough studies on the historical, legal, economic, political, diplomatic and strategic aspects of the (future) issue

have been made. The consensus is that it is quite unlikely that China will take back Hong Kong or the New Territories in 1997 when the New Territories lease expires."[47] Ming Pao often made its point through the use of metaphors or parables. For example, it said, "Some people hold the view that following the takeover by China and the introduction of limited changes to the system here prosperity may still survive. This is from an idealistic rather than a pragmatic point of view and is not founded on facts. .....Hong Kong is a strange goose laying golden eggs. It is not beautiful at all, offensive to the eyes of many others. However, if it is stripped of its ugly feathers and dressed in phoenix or peacock feathers, it will cease to lay gold eggs."[48]

Although Ming Pao's trust in Britain's commitment to Hong Kong was not as strong as the rightist papers, it nevertheless defended Mrs. Thatcher's promise of moral responsibility towards Hong Kong when she was under attack by leftist newspapers.[49] It reasoned that the British, albeit on the weaker side of the negotiation table, had three cards in their favor. One is the "public opinion card:" the majority of Hong Kong's citizens favor the status quo. The second is the "prosperity and stability card"--that is, the PRC's economic self-interest to preserve Hong Kong's status quo. The third is the "international treaty card," referring to China's obligation to observe the Nanking Treaty by which Hong Kong was ceded to Britain. With these three cards in hand, Ming Pao predicted that the British would have more to bargain for than a simple abrogation of Hong Kong's sovereignty."[50]

Ming Pao doubted that the PRC policies being disclosed would be feasible. In particular,it raised the concern that once current PRC leaders died, their policies towards Hong Kong might have the continuity problem.[51] Meanwhile, Ming Pao did not think that the Chinese leaders would be willing to state their promises in black and white terms.[52]

After Hu Yaobang announced that the PRC would regain Hong Kong on July 1, 1997, Ming Pao began to show signs of growing accommodation to Beijing's plans. Commenting on Ji Pengfei's (head of the PRC's Hong Kong and Macao Office) promises of high degree of autonomous rule by the Hong Kong people, the rule of law and the free flow of capital, Ming Pao said: "For fairness' sake, we would say the measures enumerated by Ji Pengfei are liberal enough to make the people here feel satisfied. There are still some issues to be touched upon.... But these can hardly be described as key issues."[53] Since then Ming Pao has published long editorials to provide economic, political and strategic rationales for the PRC's policies, saying that they might not be untrustworthy after all.[54] When Premier Zhao Ziyang reiterated the PRC's Hong Kong polices in his address to the Canadian parliament in June 1983, Ming Pao was quick to point out that it represented an "official pledge and guarantee to the people throughout the world" and reflected the PRC's "sincerity" in implementing its pledge.[55]

Ming Pao's shift of journalistic paradigm appeared to take a quantum leap as the Joint Declaration was about to be initialized. Its editorials have thence used lengthy quotes from Xin-

hua and other PRC officials in an effort to clear up what it perceived to be public misunderstandings of China's policies.[56] This process culminated in a series of editorials heaping praises on the concept of "one country, two systems" and the Declaration. In an article especially written for the People's Daily (the CCP's official organ), Louis Cha, publisher and principal editorial writer of Ming Pao, reiterated the idea that the concept of "one country, two systems", being "far-sighted and grand in scope", serves as a model of conflict resolution for the whole world. Cha concluded that it is "a dictum that can teach a hundred generations."[57]

Ming Pao urged the Hong Kong people to have confidence in the "one country, two sytems" plan because it is born out of concrete situation rather than ideological orthodox and is linked to China'primary national goals.[58] Evaluating the Joint Declaration, Ming Pao said: "After a deta led reading of the agreement, we discovered the demands that we have raised in the past two years have all been incorporated. We may say that both China and Britain have accepted all -- not just the basic ones but 100% -- of the requests made by the majority of the Hong Kong people. We cannot really think of what else to add to such an agreement. The Hong Kong people have got what they wished, what else can they ask for?" Cha, as a prominent member of both the Basic Law Drafting Committee and its Consultative Committee, has professed to participate actively to effect a smooth political transition.

Ultra-rightist Journalistic Paradigm

The utlra-rightist newspapers, Kung Sheung and Hong Kong Times, have editorially opposed the PRC's policies. Their editorial paradigm largely remained unscathed in spite of the structural power change. But subtle signs of accomodation can be detected. During the Sino-British negotiation, the utlra-rightist newspapers strongly supported the British pursuit of continued rule over Hong Kong. Welcoming Mrs. Margaret Thatcher's visit to Hong Kong, for example, the Times said: "In an interview with the BBC, Mrs. Thatcher repeatedly stated that Britain is responsible to the five million people of Hong Kong. She also mentioned that Hong Kong's prosperity is attributable to British rule over the years. Hong Kong's citizens have faith in Britain which is responsible to them. The British prime minister has also restated that Britain will keep the three Sino-British treaties which cannot be repealed at will. .....Our previous quotations from Mrs. Thatchers prove that this British prime minister pays considerable attention to the interest and wishes of the Hong Kong people."[59]

Both Kung Sheung and the Times argued that "the nature of the Hong Kong problem" could not be encased in such terms as "national interest" or "nationalism" but must rest in the "livelihood of the Hong Kong people." Kung Sheung argued that Hong Kong's "autonomy and independence" was an appropriate realization of "nationalism."[60] The Times, claiming that Beijing is not a legitimate negotiator with Britain over Hong Kong's sovereignty, denied the validity of the Joint Declara-

tion thus produced.[61]

Aa a recurring theme before and after the Joint Declaration, they pictured "one country, two systems" as nothing but a "united front gimmick" designed to deceive the Hong Kong people.[62] The Times' editorials, pointing to the PRC's tumultuous thirty-year history, described the new policies as "sugar-coated poison".[63] Similarly, Kung Sheung cast doubt on the PRC's promise of autonomous rule in Hong Kong. It said: "The slogan of`Hong Kong people administering Hong Kong' and the idea of turning Hong Kong into a`special administrative region' have dangerous ulterior motives. They are sugar-coated poison designed to kill two birds with one stone. On the one hand, they soften Hong Kong people's determination to maintain Hong Kong as it is. On the other, nationalism, as they seemingly implied, disarms Hong Kong people's resistance."[64]

Now that political dust is settled, the integrity of editorial agenda of the ultra-rightist press is being put to a severe test. Overall, both papers showed little sign of editorial paradigm shift, insisting that they could not acknowledge the letigimacy of the Declaration. But as newspapers, they could not totally shun away from editorial responsibility to cover major political development such as the Joint Declaration, the Basic Law Drafting Committee and its Consultative Committee, Xinhua's activities and the PRC's elaborations of the idea of "one country, two systems."[65] Kung Sheung, facing what it perceived to be an increasingly hostile political environment, opted to close down in late 1984. As a KMT organ, the Times has taken a tactical turn from hardline to milder anti-communism as

seen in the ouster of six staunch anti-communist columnists,[66] the cancellation of a page devoted exclusively to anti-communist themes and the softening of its overall rhetorics. The Times has supported, in news and editorials, local rightist and centrist groups calling on Beijing to let Hong Kong have parliamentary democracy. Such acts represent an indirect and subtle way of acquiescence.

Ultra-leftist Journalistic Paradigm

The ultra-leftist newspapers, similar in their editorial paradigm, have considerably moderated their stance toward the Hong Kong Government after the Sino-British accord. They have toned down anti-colonial rhetorics and have "rehabilitated" the colonial institutions and policies they once so harshly criticized. As recent as mid-1983, Governor Youde was seen by Wen Wei Pao as a local agent of the British Empire whose interest was incongruent with that of the Hong Kong community.[67] In the heat of the "public opinion war" amidst negotiation deadlocks, both papers published several editorials tending to delegitimize colonial rule. One of them posed a series of rhetorical questions: "What is the Hong Kong Government? A fair coordinator and distributor of interest or a partial ruler in favor of corporate interest at the sacrifice of public welfare? Does the Government really listen to public opinion? Or does it merely act from its self-interest and the opinions of a few? We have often heard of boasts about how much the Government respects public opinion and how perfect its political system is, but on the issue of price raises, where

is this respect for public opinion?"[68]

No sooner had the Joint Declaration been initialized in 1984 than both papers switched their editorial stance to legitimize the Hong Kong Governor as a ruler serving public good. Commenting on the Governor's annual report, Wen Wei Pao said: "At the conclusion of the Sino-British negotiation, people doubted whether Hong Kong's prosperity could be preserved, Governor Youde's third report has given positive answers."[69] Moreover, both papers have moderated their traditionally critical evaluations of the colonial regime's performance. Wen Wei Pao's 1985 annual review said "In spite of the general slackening of the world's economy and the rise of trade protectionism, Hong Kong's economy remains stable and has secured some growth. ..... In light of the neighboring areas' zero or negative growth, we can only conclude that Hong Kong's economic achievement is not easily attained."[70]

Hong Kong Government's Independent Commission Against Corruption (ICAC) was once labelled by the Communist press as an organization designed to rectify corruption inherent in colonial capitalism in order to prolong British rule. In very different terms, Ta Kung Pao now had this to say: "The suspects charged by the ICAC will certainly be tried according to strict legal procedures. Hong Kong remains as a society ruled by law and citizens still have confidence in legal justice. People need not speculate about what is behind the scene. What we want to point out is this: The establishment of ICAC is no doubt a positive factor for the Hong Kong

society."[71] Likewise, Wen Wei Pao has also enthusiastically endorsed the Hong Kong Government's decision to go on with a construction project. The paper seized this project as a "proof" that despite, even because of, the political transition, Hong Kong continued to be a stable and prosperous entity-- something that had previously been described as "deceptive" or "distorted."[72]

Seldom had the Communist press commented on elections sponsored by the colonial regime. When they did, the comments were largely derogatory. When the colonial regime tried in the early 1970s to promote a sense of "Hong Kong belongingness" among citizens, the Communist press regarded it as an attempt to check the growth of nationalism among the students. In reference to district council elections in early 1985, however, Wen Wei Pao argued that "an active participation in public affairs" is "essential."[73] Urging the Hong Kong Government to use civil education to ensure that the voters Knew what they were doing, it concluded: "Hopefully, this district council election can enhance the citizens' sense of social participation."

It should be noted that moderating its anti-colonialism does not imply that the ultra-leftist press refrain from criticizing the Hong Kong government in toto. But these criticisms are now framed as "constructive" suggestions, unlike past characterizations of colonial rule as fundamentally immoral.

Conclusion

The aim of this article is to examine the paradigm shift of mass media in relation to the changing configuration of political power. In the context of Hong Kong's political transition, the press editorials (along with news and other evidence not reported here) have shifted their worldviews in regard to the dualistic power structure. Once political reality was redefined in terms of British withdrawal, mass media have constrained their discourse within the parameter of the idea of "one country, two systems."

The shift of journalistic paradigms varies with the press' political ideology or affiliation. As expected, the centrist and rightist newspapers, because of organizational and ideological flexibility, have shown much greater accommodation to Xinhua than have the ultra-rightist newspapers. Particularly notable is the former's shift from an initial preference for continued British rule to final acquiescence to (even an endorsement of) the PRC's takeover. The two ultra-rightist newspapers, Kung Sheung and Hong Kong Times, have adopted different paths of adaptation. Kung Sheung has chosen to opt out while the Times has chosen to stay (at least for now) and has softened its hardline anti-communist rhetorics. As 1997 draws nearer, there will be growing pressure put on the Times towards conformity. The paper may respond by accommodating Xinhua as a legitimate power center, or remain faithful to its position until the date when it must quit. Finally, the ultra-leftist newspapers, under the direction of Xinhua, have moderated their anti-colonial overtones. The emergent cordiality between the Communist press and

the colonial regime is to continue, in view of the promise by the PRC in the Sino-British Joint Declaration to provide cooperation in the interest of stability and prosperity. Since Hong Kong's transition is gradually phased in, the media will shift their journalistic paradigms in a cumulative and incremental fashion. The new journalistic paradigms are born of the old, showing both continuities and discontinuities. The paradigm shift is as yet incomplete and will be elaborated until long after the change of power in 1997.

Will pluralistic media voices be lost? The political boundary, as previously analyzed, has narrowed. But given Hong Kong's vibrant market economy and the PRC's promise of preserving Hong Kong's capitalism beyond 1997, we do not believe that Hong Kong will lose its pluralsitic media in toto. The press has undoubtedly reshaped its journalistic paradigms, largely moving towards the center of gravity and accommodating the twin power structure. But journalistic paradigms, like political development, are dynamically changing and may take unexpected turns. Will the Beijing leadership remain stable? Will the PRC keep its promises? How will Hong Kong's social formations be shaped? How will the media maintain their relative autonomy? All these questions will determine the content of journalistic paradigms in the future.

FOOTNOTES

1. Lucian Pye, "Communication and Political Culture in China," Asian Survey, 18, 3:221-246 (1978).

2. Joseph M. Chan and Lee Chin-chuan, "Journalistic Paradigms on Civil Protests: A Case Study in Hong Kong", in Andrew Arno and Wimal Dissanayake (eds.), The News Media in National and International Conflict (Boulder, Colorado: Westview and University of Hawaii Press, 1984). The concept of "paradigm", in a metaphysical sense, is borrowed from Thomas Kuhn, The Structure of Scientific Revolutions (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970) 2nd Edition.

3. The Concept of "journatistic paradigms" is akin to that of "news frames" (Gitlin, Tuchman), "news perspectives" (Gans), and "media logics" (Altheide and Snow); see Herbert Gans, Deciding What is News (New York: Panthon, 1979); Todd Gitlin, The Whole World is Watching (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980); David Altheide and Robert Snow, Media Logic (Beverly Hills: Sage, 1979); Gaye Tuchman, Making News (New York: Free Press, 1978). Journalistic paradigms, consituted in and by specific sociocultural contexts, are by no means universal. While in western democracies the primary paradigm is media professionalism and objectivity, political ideology and partisanship figure more importantly in determining journalistic paradigms of the Third World press. Media professinalism is not ideologically free; critics argue that western liberal media typify power center as neutral, objective, and detached; the practical problem of "objectivity" is solved by establishing an official point of reference for news. They claim that liberal media thus objectify the status quo and construct legitimacy. See Gans, Ibid; Tuchman, Ibid; Michael Schudson, Discovering the News (New York: Basic, 1978); Philip Schlesinger, Putting 'Reality' Together (London: Constable, 1978); Edward Said, Covering Islam (New York: Patheon, 1980); Robert K. Monoff and Michael Schudson (eds.), Reading the News (New York: Pantheon, 1986).

4. Chan and Lee, op. cit. Related research includes Chin-chuan Lee, "Partisan Press Coverage of Government News in Hong Kong," Journalism Quarterly, 62:770-776(1985).

5. Lance Bennett, Lynn Gresssett and William Haltom, "Repairing the News: A Case Study of the News Paradigm," Journal of Communication, 35,2:50-68 (1985); cf. Kuhn, op. cit.

6. Kuhn, op. cit.; Bennett et al., Ibid.

7. Clarice Olien, Philip Tichenor and George Donohue, "Structure, Communication and Social Power Evolution of the Knowledge Gap Hypothesis," Netherlands Journal of Communication (1982).

8. Majid Tehranian, "Iran: Communication, Alienation and Revolution," Intermedia 7,2:6-12(1979); Pye, op. cit.; Chin-chuan Lee, Media Imperialism Reconsidered (Beverly Hills: Sage, 1980), pp.203-237.

9. Lau Siu-kai, Society and Politics in Hong Kong (Hong Kong: The Chinese University of Hong Kong Press, 1982); Peter Harris, Hong Kong: A Study in Bureaucratic Politics (Hong Kong: Heinemann Asia, 1978).

10. Sin Loong, A Shadow Government of Hong Kong (Hong Kong: Hai-san, 1985).

11. Joseph Man Chan, Shifting Journalistic Paradigms: Mass Media and Political Transition in Hong Kong. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, the University of Minnesota, (1986).

12. The Political Impact of Mass Media (London:Constable, 1974)

13. Chan, op. cit.

14. "Inaugural Proclamation," Kung Sheung, July 8, 1925.

15. Chin-chuan Lee and Joseph Man Chan, "Journalistic Paradigms in Flux: Mass Media and Political Transition in hong Kong," paper presented at the 36th annual convention of the International Communication Association, Chicago, May 22-26, 1986; see also Chan, op. cit.

16. See Gitlin, op. cit. pp. 303-305.

17. "Continual absence of assuring news for the Hong Kong people," Editorial, Sing Tao, December 4, 1982.

18. "The female prime minister commits to moral responsibility with iron shoulders," Editoral, Sing Tao, September 29, 1982.

19. For example: "Have confidence in London's promises," Editorial, Sing Tao, July 6, 1983; "The Hong Kong Government has successfully diverted a disaster," Editorial, Sing Tao, September 28, 1983.

20. "Hong Kong has a very bright future," Editorial, Sing Tao, September 30, 1982.

21. "In the aftermath of initialting the agreement on Hong Kong's future," Editorial, Sing Tao, September 27, 1984. Sing Tao showed its acquiesce to the political developement right after Foreign Minister Howe announced Britain's decision to return Hong Kong to the PRC in April, 1984 ("The three main points in Foreign Minister Howe's announcement," Editorial, Sing Tao, December 8, 1984).

22. "Revive the confidence to invest in Hong Kong," Editorial, Sing Tao, December 12, 1984.

23. "The last day of a year again," Editorial, Sing Tao, December 12, 1984.

24. "To discuss with Ji Pengfei on seven issues," Editorial, Sing Tao, December 12, 1985.

25. "Peng Zhen's talk and Hong Kong future," Editorial, Wah Kiu, July 21, 1982; "The history and reality that deserve respect," Editorial, Wah Kiu, August 4, 1982; "Looking at the Beijing-London-Hong Kong relationship in a broad and long-term perspective," Editorial, Wah Kiu, September 24, 1982; "What Mrs. Thatcher cannot disclose at will," Editorial, Wah Kiu, September 29, 1982.

26. "Welcoming the British Prime Minister Mrs. Thatcher to visit Hong Kong," Editorial, Wah Kiu, September 27, 1982; "What Mrs. Thatcher cannot disclose at will," Editorial, Wah Kiu, September 29, 1982; "Negotiation on Hong Kong's future advances into the second stage," Editorial, Wah Kiu, July 4, 1983; "Governor Youde: the burden is heavy, the road is long, " Editorial, Wah Kiu, July 28, 1983.

27. "The right directions for negotiations on Hong Kong's future," Editorial, Wah Kiu, May 26, 1983.

28. "Some principles for negotiation over Hong Kong's future," Editorial, Wah Kiu, January 3, 1984, "Dangerous arguments to be keenly watched," Editorial, January 27, 1984.

29. "The date on which Hong Kong's sovereignty will be retaken is decided," Editorial, Wah Kiu, August 17, 1983. An editorial that best illustrates Wah Kiu's tendency to speak indirectly for Beijing at this early stage is: " The concept and outline of 'Hong Kong Special Administrative Region'," Editorial, October 17, 1983.

30. "Dangerous arguments to be keenly watched," Editorial, Wah Kiu, January 27, 1984.

31. "Hong Kong people's wish," Editorial, Wah Kiu, August 2, 1984.

32. "The righteousness of nationalism," Mui Yu Column, Oriental Daily News, February 5, 1933. The same idea was reiterated in two other Mui Yu columns: "The righteousness of nationalism," February 5, 1983; "Imperialism," October 17, 1983.

33. "Hong Kong law ruling Hong Kong," Mui Yu Column, Oriental Daily News, June 24, 1983.

34. "Negotiating the future," Mui Yu Column, Oriental Daily News, December 8, 1983. Shortly after this, Miu Yiu indicated that he had learnt of the British decision to withdraw from Hong Kong ("See who changes first," Oriental Daily News, January 25, 1984.)

35. "High evaluation of Hong Kong people," Mui Yu Column, Oriental Daily News, January 1, 1984.

36. After CCP consolidated its power in early 1950s, it launched programs to nationalize the economy. In its transitional phase, the nationalist bourgeois were promised of "co-ownership" which was finally swept away by CCP's speedy measures to root out the private sector.

37. "The new is different from the old," Mui Yu Column, Oriental Daily News, April 6, 1984.

38. "Twelve points of policy for Hong Kong," April 28, 1984.

39. For example, "Sino-British Accord," Mui Yu Column, Oriental Daily News, August 2, 1984; "Moral responsibility," Mui Yu Column, Oriental Daily News, September 13, 1984.

40. See, e.g., "Those who believe will be saved," Mui Yu Column, Oriental Daily News, April 30, 1984; "Don't be afraid of interference," Mui Yu Column, Oriental Daily News, October 6, 1984; "Rumours feed on rumours," Mui Yu Column, Oriental Daily News, October 7, 1984.

41. "How to evaluate the Hong Kong question," Editorial, Sing Pao, September 23, 1983.

42. "Alleviate the 'Jardine Shock Immediately,'" Editorial, Sing Pao, March 30, 1984.

43. "Both the Agreement or the Joint Declaration have legal binding force," Editorial, Sing Pao, September 18, 1984; "The blueprint for a smooth transition," Editorial, Sing Pao, August 2, 1984.

44. "All the reactions to the Joint Declaration," Editorial, Sing Pao, September 29, 1984.

45. "Actively participate to practise civil rights," Editorial, Sing Pao, September 28, 1984.

46. "Competition for Lunar New Year stalls shows confidence," Editorial, Sing Pao, January 7, 1986.

47. Three requirements for an arrangement on Hong Kong's status," Ming Pao editorial, February 19, 1981.

48. "A Strange goose that lays gold eggs," Editorial, Ming Pao, October 14, 1982.

49. "Britain's moral responsibility towards Hong Kong," Editorial, Ming Pao, October 20, 1982.

50. "Three cards in the British hand," Editorial, Ming Pao July 4, 1983.

51. "'Same as before'; free entry and exit," Editorial, Ming Pao, November 25, 1982.

52. Note 55; and "Horses must be fed to make it work," Editorial, Ming Pao, July 7, 1983.

53. "Ji Pengfei's concrete measures for "Hong Kong administered by Hong Kong people," Editorial, Ming Pao, October 15, 1983.

54. See, e.g., "From '79' to '97'," Editorial, Ming Pao, October 24, 1983; "Making use of Hong Kong over a long time rather than imposing reforms," Editorial, Ming Pao, October 25, 1983; "Fundamental demands by China, Britain and Hong Kong," Editorial, Ming Pao, December 15, 1983.

55. "Pledge and guarantee of an international nature," Editorial, Ming Pao, January 24, 1984.

56. See "Deng Xiaoping talked about the confidence problem of the Hong Kong people," Editorial, Ming Pao, June 27, 1984; "How policies on Hong Kong are made," Editorial, Ming Pao, August 11, 1984.

57. Louis Cha, "An innovation applicable to the whole world," People's Daily, September 26, 1984. Similar ideas were voiced earlier in a Ming Pao editorial entitled "A model applicable to the world," published on June 29, 1984.

58. "Confidence is to be based on what kind of foundation?" Editorial, Ming Pao, July 2, 1984.

59. "Welcoming the British Prime Minister to visit Hong Kong," Editorial, Hong Kong Times, September 26, 1982. Similar comments are reiterated in Kung Sheung's editorial, "The British Prime Minister's stand on the Hong Kong question is firm," November 5, 1983.

60. "Comments on the visit of the intellectuals' tour in mainland China," Editorial, Kung Sheung, April 14, 1983; "On the question of 'Hong Kong's sovereignty'," Editorial, Kung Sheung, October 22, 1982; "'Nationalism' dicatates 'autonomous independence'," Editorial, Kung Sheung, April 4, 1983.

61. "Stay calm amidst changes, unite and self-help," Editorial, Hong Kong Times, September 27, 1984; "The unglorious 'initialization'," Editorial, Hong Kong Times, September 24, 1984; "Hong Kong people do not recognise the 'Joint Declaration'," Editorial, Hong Kong Times, September 4, 1984.

62. For example: "Hong Kong people definitely do not believe the Communist Party's promises," Editorial, Hong Kong Times, April 16, 1984; "Communists' words cannot be trusted," Editorial, Hong

Kong Times, August 3, 1984; "The two cutting edges of local communists' united front tactics," Editorial, Kung Sheung, September, 16, 1984; "The so-called 'Hong Kong model'," Editorial, Hong Kong Times, December 24, 1984.

63. "Don't eat 'sugar-coated poison'," Editorial, Hong Kong Times, January 12, 1984.

64. "'Hong Kong administering Hong Kong' is sugar-coated poison," Editorial, Kung Sheung, December 9, 1982.

65. See editorials on the Joint Declaration: e.g. "Analysing the "Joint Declaration Draft," Kung Sheung, September 27, 1984; "Stay calm amidst changes, unite and self-help," Hong Kong Times, September 27, 1984. Editorials on the Basic Law: e.g. "Hong Kong People have the absolute right in making the 'Basic Law'," Kung Sheung, October 25, 1984.

66. What began as a successional fight among the Times' staff evolved into a political fight. On one side are the hardliners who asserted that they should fight against communism simply "for the sake of anti-communism". The opposing faction thought it was for "truth" that they fought communism. The major difference between these two approaches is that the first regards anti-communism as a permanent goal which does not change with times while the second asserts that anti-communism should be practised in a "rational" way and should give "due regards" to changes within China. The controversy ended in an organizatinal reshuffling in which six staunch anti-communist columnists ~~were~~ resigned and a page that was devoted to hardline anti-communism was cancelled. See Min-kwun Leung, "Anti-communist outpost in Chaos," the Nineties Monthly, January, 1985.

67. "Who does Sir Youde represent?" Editorial, Wen Wei Pao, July 9, 1983.

68. "Check the trend of price raises to ensure the public's livelihood," Editorial, Wen Wei, September 16, 1983. Other exemplary editorials that raised serious doubts about the Government's respect for public opinion include: (1) "Has public opinion ever been respected?" Editorial, Wen Wei Pao September 5, 1983. (2) "The lound calls for preserving the public's livelihood," Editorial, Wen Wei Pao, September, 19, 1983. (3) "How constructive can the "Lubo Motion" be?" Editorial, Ta Kung Pao March 15, 1984.

69. "An aggressive and solid annual report," Editorial, Wen Wei Pao, October 7, 1984.

70. "Reviewing Hong Kong in its first year of transition," Editorial, Wen Wei Pao, December 31, 1986. This generally favorable review can also be contrasted with Ta Kung Pao's generally critical review two years earlier; "Reading Youde's administrative report, Editorial, Ta Kung Pao, October 16, 1983.

71. Ta Kung Pao, "The Editor's Note" February 27, 1986.

72. Such characterizations of Hong Kong's prosperity were common in past ultra-leftist newspapers' editorials. A more recent illustration can be found in Ta Kung Pao's short editorial, "High land price policy is devastating," December 4, 1982.

73. "On District Council Election," Editorial, Wen Wei Pao, January 22, 1985.